
Fassler Avenue Residential Project
Final
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2006062150

Lead Agency:

City of Pacifica
Planning Department
1800 Francisco Boulevard
Pacifica, CA 94044

Contact:

Bonny O'Connor, Assistant Planner
(650) 738-7341
o'connorb@ci.pacifica.ca.us

September 2017



Fassler Avenue Residential Project
Final
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2006062150

Lead Agency:

City of Pacifica
Planning Department
1800 Francisco Boulevard
Pacifica, CA 94044

Contact:

Bonny O'Connor, Assistant Planner
(650) 738-7341
o'connorb@ci.pacifica.ca.us

September 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
A. LOCATION AND SETTING	I-1
B. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	I-1
C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS	I-2
D. USE OF THIS DOCUMENT	I-3
II. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS	II-1
A. OVERVIEW	II-1
B. LIST OF THOSE WHO COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT SEIR	II-2
Commenters	
1. Hal Bohner	II-4
2. JoAnne Arnos	II-10
III. CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE DRAFT SEIR	III-1
IV. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM	IV-1

TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
II-1 List of Commenters on the Draft SEIR	II-3
IV-1 Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impacts and Method of Evaluation	IV-3

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - CD of the DSEIR

This page intentionally left blank

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Sections 15088, 15089, and 15132 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Pacifica (the “City”) has prepared this Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (“Final SEIR”) for the Fassler Avenue Residential Project (“proposed project” or “project”). This Final SEIR includes the following chapters: 1) Introduction; 2) Response to Comments; 3) Corrections and Additions to the Draft Supplemental EIR (“Draft SEIR”); and 4) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. An electronic copy of the Draft SEIR is also included on a CD as Attachment A to this Final SEIR.

A. LOCATION AND SETTING

The project site is located at 801 Fassler Avenue in the City of Pacifica (APNs: 022-083-020 and 022-083-030). The approximately 11.2-acre project site is located in the southwest portion of the City in the Rockaway Neighborhood and is bounded by Fassler Avenue on the west and south, and vacant land to the north and southeast.

The project site consists of hilly terrain and generally slopes from a peak in the southeast portion (approximately 440 feet above mean sea level) of the site to a low point in the northwest region (240 feet above msl) of the project site. The average slope from the highest to lowest point on the project site is approximately 17.7 percent. The project site is currently vacant with the exception of the remnants of the old asphalt road and contains three different habitat types: coastal scrub, perennial grassland, and willow scrub. In addition to the non-native species currently present on the project site, there are two Monterey Cypress trees present, both having trunks with a circumference greater than 50 inches.

Approximately 7.6 acres of the western portion of the site is Open Space Residential and the remaining 3.6 acres is designated as Low Density Residential. The zoning for the project site is Planned Development District (P-D), a classification designed to allow diversification of the relationships of various buildings, structures and open spaces in planned building groups, while ensuring compliance with district regulations. A more detailed description of the project site’s regional and local setting is provided in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft SEIR.

B. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In 2004, an application was submitted to the City of Pacifica for the Prospects Residential Project which consisted of 34 residential units, a subterranean parking garage, and associated amenities in the western two acres of the project site. In 2007, the City certified a Final EIR and approved a reduced version of the Prospects Residential Project totaling 29 residential units. However, the entitlements for that project have since lapsed and no building permits were issued by the City.

The Fassler Avenue Residential Project is proposed at the same site and consists of 24 condominium units in 12 duplex buildings for a development area of 1.2 acres on the 11.2-acre site. The proposed project is to be developed generally within the same building footprint as the Prospects Residential Project but some of the design and construction details differ from the prior project, including but not limited to project layout, garages and surface parking, access, an above-grade loop road, building heights, and stormwater management. The proposed project also includes a stormwater detention basin and water quality basin at the southwestern corner of the site instead of an amphitheater that was proposed as a part of the original project that would have also been used for stormwater collection and storage. A more detailed description of the proposed project is provided in Section IV, Project Description, of the Draft SEIR.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15063, the City prepared an Initial Study (Appendix A to the Draft SEIR), which concluded that the proposed project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts, and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (“SEIR”) would be required. The City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) (Appendix A to the Draft SEIR) of a Draft SEIR for the proposed project to the State Clearinghouse and interested agencies and persons on October 19, 2015 for a 30-day review period and conducted a scoping meeting on October 29, 2015. The NOP and scoping meeting solicited comments from identified responsible and trustee agencies, as well as interested parties regarding the scope of the SEIR. Comment letters submitted to the City in response to the NOP as well as comments from the public scoping meeting are included in Appendix B of the Draft SEIR.

The Draft SEIR was made available to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 48-day public review period from June 7, 2017 through July 24, 2017. The City conducted a public meeting on the Draft SEIR to accept written comments on the Draft SEIR on June 29, 2017; however, no members of the public attended the meeting and no written comments were submitted at this meeting.

The Draft SEIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. Copies of a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR were also sent to citizens surrounding the project site, interested groups and agencies. In addition, on June 7, 2017 the *Pacifica Tribune* included a notice regarding the availability of the Draft SEIR. Copies of the Draft SEIR were made available for review at the San Mateo County Library, Pacifica Sanchez Branch and Pacifica-Sharp Park Branch, at the City Planning Department public counter, and online at the City’s website, http://www.cityofpacifica.org/depts/planning/environmental_documents/default.asp.

The purpose of the review period is to provide interested public agencies, groups and individuals the opportunity to comment on the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and to submit testimony on the possible environmental effects of the proposed project.

This document, together with the Draft SEIR, makes up the Final SEIR as defined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 as follows:

The Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft EIR or a revision of the draft.*
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.*
- (c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.*
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.*
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.*

As Lead Agency under CEQA, the City must provide each public agency that commented on the Draft SEIR with a copy of its responses to comments at least 10 days before certifying the Final SEIR. In addition, the Lead Agency may also provide an opportunity for members of the public to review the Final EIR before certification, although this is not a requirement of CEQA.

D. USE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The Final SEIR allows the public and Lead Agency to review any revisions to the Draft SEIR, comments, and responses to comments before consideration of project approval. This Final SEIR (which includes the Draft EIR, incorporated by reference) will serve as the environmental document used by the City when considering approval of the project. After completing the Final SEIR and before approving the project, the Lead Agency must make the following three certifications (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090):

- The Final SEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.
- The Final SEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final SEIR prior to approving the project.
- The Final SEIR reflects the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis.

In addition, if an EIR that has been certified for a project identifies one or more significant environmental impacts, the Lead Agency must adopt findings of fact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[a]). For each significant impact, the Lead Agency must make one of the following findings.

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Each finding must be accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for the finding. In addition, the Lead Agency must adopt, in conjunction with the findings, a program for reporting or monitoring the changes that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[d]). These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. This program is referred to as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and is provided in Section IV of this Final SEIR.

In addition, when a Lead Agency approves a project that would result in significant and unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the Final EIR, the agency must state in writing its reasons for supporting the approved action (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[b]). This statement of overriding considerations must be supported by substantial information in the record, including the Final EIR. Because the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts, the City is required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations if it approves the project.

II. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A. OVERVIEW

The purpose of the public review of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) is to evaluate the adequacy of the environmental analysis in terms of compliance with CEQA. The Draft SEIR was prepared in accordance with §15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among experts. The courts have not looked for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

The purpose of each response to a comment on the Draft SEIR is to address the significant environmental issue(s) raised by each comment. This typically requires clarification of points contained in the Draft SEIR. Section 15088 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines describes the evaluation that CEQA requires in the response to comments by stating:

The written response shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the Lead Agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. There must be good faith, reasoned analysis in response. Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice.

Section 15204(a) (Focus of Review) of the CEQA Guidelines helps the public and public agencies to focus their review of environmental documents and their comments to lead agencies. Case law has held that the Lead Agency is not obligated to undertake every suggestion given them, provided that the agency responds to significant environmental issues and makes a good faith effort at disclosure. Section 15204.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines clarifies this for reviewers by stating:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be

avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a Lead Agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

This guideline encourages reviewers to examine the sufficiency of the environmental document, particularly in regard to significant effects, and to suggest specific mitigation measures and project alternatives. Given that an effect is not considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence, subsection (c) advises reviewers that comments should be accompanied by factual support. Section 15204(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and, should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

B. LIST OF THOSE WHO COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT EIR

The City of Pacifica received a total of two comment letters on the Draft SEIR. While the City conducted a public meeting to accept written comments on the Draft SEIR on June 29, 2017, no written comments were submitted at this meeting. Each comment letter has been assigned a corresponding number, and comments within each comment letter are also numbered. For example, comment letter "A" is from Hal Bohner. The comments subsequently follow the following format, "A-1, A-2, A-3, etc." in this Final SEIR.

Written comments made during the 48-day public review of the Draft SEIR intermixed points and opinions relevant to the project's merits with points and opinions relevant to the potentially significant environmental effects of the project. The responses acknowledge or note comments addressing points and opinions relevant to the project's merits, and discuss as necessary the points relevant to the environmental review required by CEQA. Table II-1 lists the persons who provided written comments on the Draft SEIR to the City during the public review period.

**Table II-1
List of Commenters on the Draft SEIR**

Correspondence Alpha	Date of Correspondence or Oral Comment	Commenter
Written Comments		
<i>Public Meeting</i>		
N/A	June 5, 2017	No Comments Provided
<i>Individuals</i>		
A	July 15, 2017	Hal Bohner
B	July 24, 2015	JoAnne Arnos

Hal Bohner

Attorney
115 Angelita Avenue • Pacifica, CA 94044
phone 650-359-4257
hbohner@earthlink.net

Sent by email to o'connorb@ci.pacifica.ca.us
July 15, 2017

Bonny O'Connor
Assistant Planner
City of Pacifica Planning Department
1800 Francisco Boulevard
Pacifica, CA 94044

Re: Fassler Avenue Residential Project Draft Supplemental EIR

Dear Bonny:

I received a Notice of Availability for the DSEIR identified above and offer the following comments. The DSEIR is fatally flawed. One major flaw is that the Threshold of Significance for Traffic discussed e.g. in Section V.F. is not valid. Another reason is that the analysis of cumulative impacts is fatally flawed.

A-1

Threshold of Significance

Transportation and Traffic is discussed at Pages V.F-1 through V.F-21. On Page V.F-10 the DSEIR states:

A-2

City of Pacifica Significance Criteria

The City of Pacifica currently uses a level of service standard of LOS D for all intersections. Both study intersections operate at LOS F under existing conditions; therefore, a project is said to have created a significant impact at a signalized intersection if the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by one or more seconds and the critical intersection volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by more than 0.010.

On page V.F-13 the DSEIR states:

Impact TRAFFIC-1b Existing Plus Project Intersection Operation Impacts

As shown in Appendix G-1, the delay for the critical westbound right turn movement from Fassler Avenue to SR-1 would increase by 13 seconds per vehicle, though the critical intersection vehicle-to-capacity ratio would increase by only 0.007 during the AM peak hour. Given that the project would have a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio increase of less than 0.010, it would not negatively affect any applicable plan, ordinance or policy. Therefore, project impacts to study intersections would be *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are required.

On page V.F-20 the DSEIR states:

The delay for the critical westbound right turn movement from Fassler Avenue to SR-1 would increase by 14 seconds per vehicle, though the critical intersection v/c ratio would increase by only 0.007 during the AM peak hour. The City of Pacific [sic] considers an impact to be significant if it has a V/C ratio of 0.010. Given that the Cumulative Plus Project traffic volumes V/C ratio is 0.007, there would not be a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, based on the threshold cited above, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable as well.

Although the DSEIR relies heavily on the alleged City threshold of significance the asserted threshold is not valid because it was not lawfully adopted by the City. The City has not adopted that criterion of significance in accordance with the Guidelines under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15064.7. Section 15064.7 part (b) specifies:

(b) Thresholds of significance to be adopted for general use as part of the lead agency's environmental review process must be adopted by ordinance, resolution, rule, or regulation, and developed through a public review process and be supported by substantial evidence.

However, the purported criterion of significance fails to satisfy the Guideline in at least three ways: 1) it was not adopted by resolution, rule or regulation; 2) it was not subject to a public review process; and 3) it is not supported by substantial evidence.

Cumulative Impacts

The DSEIR addresses cumulative transportation and traffic impacts of the Project at Pages V.F-19 – V.F-21. In the analysis of cumulative impacts the DSEIR fails to consider projections of future traffic in Pacifica in the Pacifica General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH No.

2012022046, March 2014 or Final Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012022046, April 2015. There are significant differences in critical conclusions between the EIR for the General Plan as compared to the DSEIR.

A-3

For example, the DSEIR reports “Cumulative Conditions – Intersection Operations” in Table V.F-8 and states that for the SR-1/Rockaway Beach / Fassler Avenue Intersection the AM and PM delays would be 312 and 145 seconds, respectively. In contrast, in the DEIR for the General Plan the comparable reported delays for 2035 are 143.4 and 155.1 seconds. For the SR-1 / Reina Del Mar intersection the AM and PM delays reported in the DSEIR are 179 and 187 seconds, respectively. In contrast, in the DEIR for the General Plan the comparable reported delays for 2035 are 211.7 and 236.3 seconds. The DSEIR should at least discuss these dramatic differences and either explain them or amend the DSEIR if necessary.

Another major shortcoming of the DSEIR’s discussion of cumulative impacts is that it fails to consider traffic which would be generated by any project built in the Pacifica Quarry, the most recent such project being proposed in 2016.

A-4

For these reasons the DSEIR is not valid and should be revised and recirculated. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

A-5

Sincerely,



Hal Bohner

Response to Comment Letter A:**Hal Bohner**Response to Comment A-1

This comment introduces ensuing comments by listing reasons the Draft SEIR is flawed, specifically targeting the Transportation and Traffic discussion and the analysis of cumulative impacts. As comments regarding each of these concerns are mentioned again in more detail in the following comments, the reader is referred to responses to comments A-2 through A-5 for detailed responses.

Response to Comment A-2

This comment states that the thresholds of significance used to evaluate level of service for traffic impacts in the Draft SEIR are not valid. In Section V.F (Transportation and Traffic), the Draft SEIR uses the City's traffic thresholds and states "The City of Pacifica currently uses a level of service standard of LOS D for all intersections". However, the commenter states that the threshold is not valid since the City has not lawfully adopted the threshold used in the Draft SEIR analysis, per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7 part (b). The comment continues to explain that the criterion of significance fails to satisfy the requirements listed in the CEQA Guidelines in three ways: 1) not being adopted by resolution, rule or regulation; 2) not being subject to a public review process; and 3) not being supported by substantial evidence. However, as described on Page IV.F-10 of the Draft SEIR:

"...a project is said to have created a significant impact at a signalized intersection if the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by one or more seconds and the critical intersection volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by more than 0.010. For unsignalized intersections, impacts occur if the worst stop-controlled approach would operate at LOS E or F with the project and the addition of project traffic causes the volumes to satisfy peak hour volume warrants for traffic signals provided by Caltrans."

Therefore, while the City of Pacifica strives to maintain a level of service standard of LOS D for all intersections, the thresholds of significance used for the proposed project are specifically related to an increase of critical movement delay and critical intersection volume-to-capacity.

According to the decision by the Second Appellate District in the case of *Save Cuyama Valley v. County of Santa Barbara* in 2013, the court ruled that CEQA "grants agencies discretion to develop their own significance thresholds" and CEQA "only requires that a threshold be formally adopted if it is for 'general use'—that is, for use in evaluating significant in all future projects". Furthermore, the significance thresholds listed in Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines are only

suggested and an EIR is not required to explain why different thresholds are used.¹ As the City does not use the above-mentioned thresholds for “general use” or the evaluation of all future projects, the thresholds of significance in the Draft SEIR are sufficient to evaluate traffic impacts for the proposed project. Furthermore, thresholds of significance not intended for general use need not be approved by resolution, rule or regulation, and are not subject to public review and comment. The thresholds of significance used in the environmental analysis to evaluate traffic impacts are consistent with existing state policy regarding traffic impacts because the thresholds evaluate increases in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the City’s street system.

In response to the comment, the following revisions have been made to the Draft SEIR to clarify the City’s goals for level of service as opposed to the thresholds of significance used to evaluate project impacts.

Page V.F-8, Paragraph 5

City of Pacifica

As discussed above, the most critical congestion in the City occurs on SR 1 and SR 35, where certain intersections and roadway segments operate at an LOS of E or F during peak periods. The C/CAG CMP designates LOS E as the threshold for significance of acceptable traffic operations on these roadways in the City of Pacifica. The City ~~designates~~ strives to maintain LOS D ~~as the threshold for significance~~ for City streets not mentioned in the CMP, and focuses on limiting further deterioration of traffic conditions by evaluating the significance of impacts of new development on highway congestion and requiring mitigation.

Page IV.F-10, Paragraph 2

City of Pacifica Significance Criteria

The City of Pacifica ~~currently uses~~ strives for a level of service standard of LOS D for all intersections. Both study intersections operate at LOS F under existing conditions; therefore, a project is said to have created a significant impact at a signalized intersection if the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by one or more seconds and the critical intersection volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by more than 0.010. For unsignalized intersections, impacts occur if the worst stop-controlled approach would operate at LOS E or F with the project and the addition of project traffic causes the volumes to satisfy peak hour volume warrants for traffic signals provided by Caltrans. These are the same criteria used in the 2006 study.

Response to Comment A-3

This comment states that the cumulative transportation and traffic discussion in Section IV.F of the Draft SEIR fails to consider projections of future traffic and notes differences in the Draft

¹ *Save Cuyama Valley v. County of Santa Barbara*, 213 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 153 Cal. Rptr. 3d 534 (2013).

SEIR cumulative conclusions and the conclusions made in the City of Pacifica's General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report and Final Environmental Impact Report. However, the City's General Plan Update has not been adopted by the City of Pacifica and the Final EIR has not been certified. Therefore, no finding or assumption used in these documents can be relied upon as a basis for findings and conclusions contained within this SEIR. No further analysis is required.

Response to Comment A-4

This comment states that the Draft SEIR's cumulative impacts discussion fails to consider traffic generated by any project built in the Pacifica Quarry. As stated on page III-11 of the Draft SEIR, CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) identifies two basic methods for establishing the cumulative environment in which the project is to be considered: the use of a list of past, present, and probable future projects (projects) and the use of projections contained in relevant planning documents (projections). For the Draft SEIR, both the projects and the projections approach have been combined to generate the most reliable future projections possible. Table III-2 (Cumulative Projects) on page III-15 of the Draft SEIR includes all of the past, present, and probably future cumulative projects identified by the City of Pacifica Planning Department. Table III-2 does not include the Pacifica Quarry Project as it was not determined to be a probable future project. The Pacifica Quarry Project is not a probably future project because a complete application has not been submitted; therefore, there is no way for the City to ascertain the scope of the project.

Response to Comment A-5

This comment provides a closing statement and summarizes that the commenter believes that the Draft SEIR is not valid pursuant to the above comments mentioned. Please refer to responses to comments A-2 through A-4. The comment will be forwarded to the decision making bodies for their consideration in adopting the Final SEIR and approving the project.

From: arnosj@sbcglobal.net [<mailto:arnosj@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:24 PM

To: O'Connor, Bonny

Subject: Objections to the Fassler Ave. Residential Project

My Serious Objections Against the Fassler Ave. Residential Project

BUILDING HEIGHTS:

B-1

Only 2 of the 12 buildings are within the height limits for HPD, the remaining 10 are all OVER THE HEIGHT LIMITATIONS, from the highest of 9 feet to the lowest 1 foot.

Placement and HEIGHT of the development Will BLOCK views of the Coastal Hills and BREAK the view of the HORIZON with rooftops.

The design, location and color of the development will have a negative impact and consequences on/to the environment overall.

MAJOR IMPACT ON THE SCENIC CORRIDOR

B-2

According to the City's general plan there should be NO significant obstruction of the scenic resources and vistas by blocking views of the Pacific Ocean and near the undeveloped area.

Again, Placement and HEIGHT of the development Will BLOCK views of the Coastal Hills and BREAK the view of the HORIZON with rooftops.

ADVERSELY AFFECTS PLANTS AND WILDLIFE SPECIES:

B-3

Adverse displacement on special-status plants and special status wildlife species to numerous to mention in this letter please see the SEIR (Supplemental Environmental Impact Report). Threat to the wildlife in the air, above the ground and below the ground.

NEGATIVE TRAFFIC IMPACT:

B-4

Fassler Ave is one of two main exits out of the valley which is already severely impacted at the height of commuting hours and other times. An Emergency disaster of any kind, Fassler would be a major evacuation route. Already overtaxed with traffic. More development is also planned by the School Board for their employees back on Oddstad Blvd. which will have more impact Fassler Ave.

I am against this project on many levels and it should be seriously evaluated for the negative impact it will have the City of Pacifica on many levels.

B-5

JoAnne Arnos

Resident 1163 Oddstad Blvd.

**Response to Comment Letter B:
JoAnne Arnos**Response to Comment B-1

This comment expresses concern regarding the building heights proposed as part of the proposed project. The comment states that 10 of the 12 buildings exceed the City's height limits, and that the placement and height of the development would block views of the coastal hills and break the view of the horizon.

Table IV-2 (Building Summary) in Section IV (Project Description) of the Draft SEIR describes the maximum heights for the proposed buildings, with the building heights ranging from 31'-1" to 44'-5". A maximum height of 35 feet is allowed in Multiple-Family Residential Districts.² A Height Variance would be required for the project because project buildings would exceed the 35-foot height limit.

As stated in on page IV.B-28 of the Draft SEIR:

"...implementation of the project would substantially alter scenic vistas by partially blocking currently unobstructed views of the Pacific Ocean and nearby undeveloped areas. As such, the proposed project would result in a significant impact to scenic vistas. Mitigation Measure AES-1 described below would reduce impacts related to scenic vistas; however, these impacts would not be eliminated to a level of less than significant. Impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable**."

The comment further states, the design, location and color of the development would have a negative impact on the environment. As stated on page IV.B-29 of the Draft SEIR:

"Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-2 would reduce impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings, but not to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would therefore remain **significant and unavoidable**."

Mitigation Measure AES-2

- Protection of existing trees on the northern elevation shall be maximized. Removal of existing trees shall be limited to conditions where future grading requirements would absolutely preclude the viability of an existing tree after construction.

² According to the Municipal Code, "Height of Buildings" is defined as "the maximum vertical distance, measured at the finished grade, between the lowest point on the site covered by any portion of a building to the top most point of the roof."

- Foundation plantings shall maximize use of native vegetation and be as visually compatible with the existing coastal sage-scrub plant community as possible.
- Landscaping shall include vegetation management of the entire parcel so as to eliminate invasive species on the site within five years and replace it with native and flowering vegetation capable of thriving without irrigation after the initial establishment period.
- Colors used for exterior building surfaces shall be as dark as possible to minimize the contrast of the structures to the surrounding coastal hills. Colors shall also be selected to minimize contrast with the horizon, particularly on the north and west elevations when structures are back-dropped by skyline. Several colors shall be used to minimize uniformity.
- Prior to building permit issuance, the grading plan, development plan, landscaping plan, sign plan, elevations, and colors and materials shall receive review and approval of the City of Pacifica staff through the design review procedures with the Planning Commission during approval of the Specific Plan.”

Therefore, the City of Pacifica acknowledges these are significant and unavoidable impacts.

Response to Comment B-2

This comment expresses concern regarding the potential impact the proposed project would have on the scenic corridor. As stated in Response to Comment B-1 above, the City acknowledges the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact to scenic resources.

Response to Comment B-3

This comment expresses concern regarding the potential of the proposed project to adversely affect special-status plants and special-status wildlife species. This comment does not state a specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the analysis or mitigation measures contained in the Draft SEIR. Furthermore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, and BIO-1d listed in pages V.C-15 through V.C-19 of the Draft SEIR, all potentially significant impacts to special-status plant wildlife species would be mitigated to a less-than significant-level. No further analysis is required.

Response to Comment B-4

This comment expresses concern regarding the potential traffic impacts the proposed project could create in relationship to emergency evacuation and that Fassler Avenue is already severely impacted by traffic during commuting hours and other times. The comment further

states that more development is planned on Oddstad Boulevard, which would also contribute to traffic impacts along Fassler Avenue.

As stated on pages V.A-17 and V.A-18 of the Draft SEIR:

“The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the City of Pacifica’s General Plan’s Safety Element. The General Plan Safety Element does not include emergency evacuation routes. The proposed project is also consistent with the objectives of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Annex for the City of Pacifica. Given the relatively low level of traffic associated with both the construction and operational phase of the project, a less-than-significant impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is necessary.”

Section IV.F (Transportation and Traffic) of the Draft SEIR evaluates cumulative traffic impacts utilizing land use projections as well as Table III-2 (Cumulative Projects) list for probable future development in the vicinity of the proposed project. As stated on page IV.F-20 of the Draft SEIR, “the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable as well”. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

Response to Comment B-5

This comment expresses the commenter’s opposition to the proposed project and states that it should be evaluated for the negative impact it will have on the City. This comment does not state a specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the analysis or mitigation measures contained in the Draft SEIR. The comment will be forwarded to the decision-making bodies as part of the Final SEIR for their consideration.

This page intentionally left blank

III. CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE DRAFT SEIR

The following corrections have been made to the Fassler Avenue Residential Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) in response to the comments received during the public review period. Changes to the Draft SEIR are listed by page number. Additions to the Draft SEIR are identified by underlined text and deletions to the Draft SEIR are identified by strikethrough text.

COVER

There are no changes to this page.

TITLE PAGE

There are no changes to this page.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

There are no changes to this notice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

There are no changes to the Table of Contents.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are no changes to this section.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are no changes to this section.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

There are no changes to this section.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

There are no changes to this section.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

V.A Project Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

There are no changes to this section.

V.B Aesthetics

There are no changes to this section.

V.C Biological Resources

There are no changes to this section.

V.D Geology and Soils

There are no changes to this section.

V.E Hydrology and Water Quality

There are no changes to this section.

V.F Transportation and Traffic

The fifth paragraph on page V.F-8 of the Draft SEIR has been revised to read as follows:

City of Pacifica

As discussed above, the most critical congestion in the City occurs on SR 1 and SR 35, where certain intersections and roadway segments operate at an LOS of E or F during peak periods. The C/CAG CMP designates LOS E as the threshold for significance of acceptable traffic operations on these roadways in the City of Pacifica. The City ~~designates~~ strives to maintain LOS D as ~~the threshold for significance~~ for City streets not mentioned in the CMP, and focuses on limiting further deterioration of traffic conditions by evaluating the significance of impacts of new development on highway congestion and requiring mitigation.

The second paragraph on page V.F-10 of the Draft SEIR has been revised to read as follows:

City of Pacifica Significance Criteria

The City of Pacifica ~~currently uses~~ strives for a level of service standard of LOS D for all intersections. Both study intersections operate at LOS F under existing conditions; therefore, a project is said to have created a significant impact at a signalized intersection if the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by one or more seconds and the critical intersection volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by more than 0.010. For unsignalized intersections, impacts occur if the worst stop-controlled approach would operate at LOS E or F with the project and the addition of project traffic causes the volumes to satisfy peak hour volume warrants for traffic signals provided by Caltrans. These are the same criteria used in the 2006 study.

V.G Noise

There are no changes to this section.

VI. GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

There are no changes to this section

VII. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

There are no changes to this section.

VIII. PREPARERS TO THE EIR AND PERSONS CONSULTED

There are no changes to this section.

This page intentionally left blank

IV. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14), which state the following:

In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

The public agency may choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both. "Reporting" generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision making body or authorized staff person. A report may be required at various stages during project implementation or upon completion of the mitigation measure. "Monitoring" is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight. There is often no clear distinction between monitoring and reporting and the program best suited to ensuring compliance in any given instance will usually involve elements of both.

Table IV-1 lists the potentially significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures identified in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Final SEIR). Table IV-1 describes the timing of implementation of the mitigation measures (i.e., when the measure will implemented) and the City of Pacifica (City) staff or individual responsible for ensuring implementation of the measures. Finally, Table IV-1 describes the City staff or individual responsibility for monitoring the mitigation measures.

This page intentionally left blank

**Table IV-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
AESTHETICS				
<p>Impact AES-1: Scenic Vistas Implementation of the proposed project would substantially alter scenic vistas by partially blocking currently unobstructed views of the Pacific Ocean and nearby undeveloped areas. As such, the proposed project would result in a significant impact to scenic vistas. Mitigation Measure AES-1 would reduce impacts related to scenic vistas; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AES-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed landscape plan dated August 11, 2015 shall be updated to be consistent the most recent version of the grading and drainage plan dated February 2016, particularly for the project detention basin and water quality basin and for the slope on the northern edge of the project site. The proposed landscape plan shall minimize the use of trees and vegetation over four feet in height on the southwest corner and along the western boundary of the site to preserve views to the Pacific Ocean and Marin County from Fassler Avenue. Trees on the south and west elevations shall be placed as close as possible to the building for effective screening and shading and also placed to avoid blocking views from Fassler Avenue to the Pacific Ocean. 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in landscape plan and project specifications and submitted to the City prior to issuance of Building Permit</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>
<p>Impact AES-2: Scenic Resources from a Scenic Highway The proposed project is visible</p>	<p>See Mitigation Measure AES-1</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>above the ridgeline from within the view corridor of Highway 1, an eligible state scenic highway. Also views along Fassler Avenue are a scenic resource according to the City's General Plan. As such, the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within an eligible scenic highway, resulting in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure AES-1 would reduce impacts related to scenic resources, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable</p>		<p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in landscape plan and project specifications and submitted to the City prior to issuance of Building Permit</p>		<p>Date</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>Impact AES-3: Visual Character of the Project Site and Surroundings The project would add residential development to an</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AES-2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of existing trees on the northern elevation shall be maximized. Removal of existing trees shall be limited to conditions where future grading 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials</p> <p>_____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>otherwise vacant site, and would substantially change the existing scenic visual character. Proposed project development is concentrated on the western portion of the site which allows views to open up to the Pacific Ocean and Marin County. This would be a permanent significant impact to the publically available views of the ocean from Fassler Avenue, and would permanently degrade the visual character of the site. Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-2 would reduce impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable</p>	<p>requirements would absolutely preclude the viability of an existing tree after construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation plantings shall maximize use of native vegetation and be as visually compatible with the existing coastal sage-scrub plant community as possible. • Landscaping shall include vegetation management of the entire parcel so as to eliminate invasive species on the site within five years and replace it with native and flowering vegetation capable of thriving without irrigation after the initial establishment period. • Colors used for exterior building surfaces shall be as dark as possible to minimize the contrast of the structures to the surrounding coastal hills. Colors shall also be selected to minimize contrast with the horizon, particularly on the north and west elevations when structures are back-dropped by skyline. Several colors shall be used to minimize uniformity. • Prior to building permit issuance, the grading plan, development plan, landscaping plan, sign plan, elevations, and colors and materials shall receive review and approval of the City of Pacifica staff through the design review procedures with the Planning Commission during approval of the Specific Plan. 	<p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in landscape plan and project specifications and submitted to the City prior to issuance of Building Permit</p>		<p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Impact AES-4 Light and Glare Implementation of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the project area. Currently, a lighting plan is not available for the project. Impacts are therefore considered to be potentially significant.</p> <p>The proposed project would include indoor lighting, and outdoor lighting for safety purposes, that would be visible from a distance. Adherence to Mitigation Measure AES-3 would ensure that outdoor lighting would be designated to minimize glare and spillover to surrounding properties.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AES-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exterior lighting plan shall show all potential light sources with the types of lighting and their locations. • Exterior lighting shall include low mounted, downward casting and shielded lights that do not cause spillover onto adjacent properties and the utilization of motion detection systems where applicable. • No flood lights shall be utilized. • Lighting shall not "wash out" structures or any portions of the site. • Low intensity, indirect light sources shall be required. • On-demand lighting systems shall be required. • Mercury, sodium vapor, and similar intense and bright lights shall not be permitted except where their need is specifically approved and their source of light is restricted. • All light sources shall be fully shielded from off-site view. • All buildings and structures shall consist of non-reflecting material or be painted with non-reflective paint. • Generally, light fixtures shall not be located at the periphery of the property and should shut off automatically when the use is not operating. Security lighting visible from Fassler Avenue shall be timed to adjust to seasonal differences. (Motion-sensor activated outdoor security lighting is not recommended since deer and other animals will trigger the sensors causing the lights to go on and off repeatedly). 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in Lighting Plan and submitted to the City prior to issuance of Building Permit</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All lighting shall be installed in accordance with building codes and the approved lighting plan during construction. 			
AIR QUALITY				
<p>Impact AIR-1: Construction Emissions The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD's) determination of significance with respect to construction emissions is based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. While BAAQMD does not implement specific thresholds for construction emissions, without implementation of specific dust control measures, impacts related to construction emissions would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AIR-1</p> <p>AIR-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction sites. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction sites. Sweep public streets adjacent to construction sites daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto the streets. 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be incorporated in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>				
<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>				
<p>Impact BIO-1: Candidate Sensitive, or Special-Status Species Special-Status Plant Species Implementation of the proposed project would not directly affect any known occurrences of special-status plant species on the site. No special-status plant species are believed to occur on the site, and no adverse impacts are anticipated. However, because protocol-level special-status plant surveys are over ten years old, the presence of special-status plant species colonization cannot be completely ruled out. Therefore, the proposed project has potential to significantly impact special-status plant species. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1a would ensure impacts to special-status plant species are mitigated to a level</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1 BIO-1a: The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining a qualified biologist to conduct rare plant surveys. Rare plant surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming periods for plant species with a moderate potential to occur prior to the onset of construction activities. If it is determined that construction-related activities will impact any special-status plant species, the Applicant, in coordination with a qualified biologist, shall prepare a mitigation plan for protecting species. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for approval prior to implementation. Mitigation measures shall be implemented by the Applicant's biologist and may include additional avoidance measures, salvaging and transplanting of plants, and collection and storage of seeds for future re-establishment efforts. For annual species, seeds shall be collected and preserved from areas of disturbance prior to the disturbance and used for reseeded efforts in late-fall to suitable areas onsite that are not subject to human disturbance. If any special-status plant species are detected, their extent and population size shall be mapped and reported to the City of Pacifica and all other appropriate agencies.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant Implementation Frequency: Measures must be incorporated in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____ Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>of less than significant.</p> <p><u>Special-Status Wildlife Species</u></p> <p>Impacts to special-status wildlife species as a result of this project would be considered potentially significant due to direct or indirect impacts on a number of species. Species that may be impacted by the project activities include: California red-legged frog and San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. In addition, several species of birds could be adversely affected if nests are established on the site before construction begins. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1b through BIO-1d impacts on special-status wildlife species would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p>	<p>BIO-1b: For the protection of California red-legged frogs; initial ground disturbing activities shall be performed during the dry season, from May 15 to October 15, in order to avoid the wet season when California red-legged frog movement generally occurs. A qualified biologist shall perform a preconstruction survey of the project site for California red-legged frogs within 48 hours prior to the start of ground disturbance activities such as vegetation removal or grading. A “qualified biologist” has experience with the identification of the species and has been previously approved by the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to conduct surveys and monitoring for California red-legged frog. The survey shall take place on the first morning prior to the start of ground disturbance including vegetation removal. Results of the survey shall be provided to the City of Pacifica. If any California red-legged frogs are found, construction within 100 feet shall be halted or as determined by the qualified biologist to prevent harm to the individual(s) until the species disperses naturally out of the work area. The biologist shall also immediately notify the USFWS Coast Bay Service Division of the Sacramento Field Office. Subsequent recommendations made by the USFWS shall be followed. The biologist shall not handle or otherwise harass the animal and shall watch the animal until it is safely outside of the work area and area of potential harm.</p>			

<p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Prior to initiation of project activities, all workers involved with ground disturbance or habitat enhancement activities shall receive environmental awareness training concerning California red-legged frog, and any other sensitive biological resources on the site. The training shall be given by a qualified biologist and shall cover the species biology, identification, any areas that are to be avoided, legal status, definition of take, potential punishment for take of California red-legged frog, and steps to follow if California red-legged frog are observed within the work area. If California red-legged frog are observed on-site and a biologist is not present, work must stop immediately, the foreman is to be notified, and a qualified biologist shall be called to survey the work area and contact the USFWS as described above. A training log shall be kept on-site of all crew members who receive the environmental awareness training. The initial training log will be submitted to the City of Pacifica for their records. Additional training logs will be submitted upon request by the City.</p> <p>During construction, all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than six inches in depth on the construction site shall be covered or have escape ramps placed within them at the end of the work day to prevent any amphibians or reptiles from becoming trapped overnight.</p> <p>Erosion control materials such as wattles shall not contain plastic netting and shall be restricted to mats, blankets, or fiber-wrapped wattles. Plastic netting including biodegradable plastic can entrap</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>amphibian and reptile species.</p> <p>If ground disturbance activities are to continue through the wet season, wildlife exclusion fencing shall be installed surrounding the construction site per USFWS standards. Wildlife exclusion fencing can consist of silt erosion control fencing that is buried 4 to 6 inches below ground, extends a minimum of 36 inches above ground, and has fence stakes installed on the work side of the silt material. The wildlife exclusion fence shall be maintained through the wet season and any needed repairs are to be made within 48 hours.</p> <p>BIO-1c: For the protection of San Francisco dusky-footed woodrats: within 30 days prior to initial vegetation removal and/or ground disturbance within the project site, a pre-construction survey for woodrat structures/houses shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. All woodrat houses within 25 feet of the work area shall be demarcated with flagging or protective fencing and avoided to the fullest extent feasible. If avoidance by at least five feet is not possible, then houses to be impacted shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Dismantling is a slow procedure which requires removal of sticks and cover by hand until a chamber is reached and can be visually inspected for presence of woodrat. If woodrat young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house, and a</p>			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>work exclusion buffer of at least 20 feet placed around the structure. The structure shall remain unmolested for at least two weeks in order to allow the young to mature and leave the nest of their own accord. After the avoidance period, the nest dismantling process may begin again. Nest material shall then be moved to suitable adjacent vegetated areas that will not be disturbed.</p> <p>BIO-1d: For the protection of special status bird species and bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as Fish and Game Codes, project activities shall occur during the non-nesting season (August 16 – January 31) to the extent feasible. However, if vegetation removal, grading, or initial ground-disturbing activities must occur during the nesting season (February 1 through August 15), a survey for active bird nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the start of these activities. The survey shall be conducted in a sufficient area around the work site to identify the location and status of any nests that could potentially be affected by project activities. Survey results shall be documented in a letter and provided to the City of Pacifica.</p> <p>If active nests of protected species are found within project impact areas or in close proximity to affect breeding success, a work exclusion zone shall be established around each nest. Established exclusion zones shall remain in place until all young</p>			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>in the nest have fledged or the nest otherwise becomes inactive (e.g., due to predation). Appropriate exclusion zone sizes vary dependent upon bird species, nest location, existing visual buffers and baseline ambient sound levels, and other factors; an exclusion zone radius may be as small as 50 feet (for common, disturbance adapted species) or as large as 250 feet or more for raptors. If the project cannot maintain the exclusion zone, a reduction in the size of the exclusion zone may be requested in coordination with the biologist and sent to the City of Pacifica for approval. Reduction of the exclusion zone size shall be supported with nest monitoring by a qualified biologist to verify that work activities outside the reduced radius are not adversely impacting the nest.</p>			
<p>Impact BIO-3: Federally Protected Wetlands Based on the October 8, 2015 wetland assessment, the areas mapped as willow thickets on the site have been determined to be likely jurisdictional wetland habitat, which would be regulated by both the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Grading necessary to</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2</p> <p>BIO-2: A Wetland Mitigation Program shall be prepared by a qualified wetland specialist to provide for the protection, replacement, and management of any jurisdictional waters on the site affected by proposed development and submitted to the City for approval prior to issuance of building permits. The Mitigation Program shall include the following components and meet the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before project implementation, a delineation of waters of the United States and waters of the State, including wetlands that could be affected 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant/HOA</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Required Program and evidence must be submitted to City along with building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: ACOE, USFWS, RWQCB</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>accommodate the residential development would extend over portions of the willow thickets and would directly impact these likely jurisdictional wetlands. This is considered a significant impact that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>by development, shall be made by a qualified wetland specialist through the formal Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide adequate mitigation for any direct or indirect impacts to jurisdictional waters as coordinated with the Corps, RWQCB, and the City of Pacifica, where complete avoidance is infeasible. Replacement wetlands shall be replaced at a minimum 2:1 replacement ratio and shall be established in suitable locations within proposed open space areas, as negotiated with and ultimately determined by the agencies. The wetlands replacement component of the Mitigation Program shall emphasize establishment of native riparian and uplands species to enhance existing habitat values. The Mitigation Program shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Pacifica prior to issuance of building or grading permits. • The wetland replacement component of the Mitigation Program shall specify performance criteria, maintenance, and long-term management responsibilities, monitoring requirements, and contingency measures. Monitoring shall be conducted by the qualified wetland specialist for a minimum of five years and continue until the success criteria are met. • In addition, the applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the Corps, USFWS, and the RWQCB as required by federal and 	<p>permit; measures must be implemented during construction and after occupancy</p>		

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>State laws to avoid, minimize, or offset impacts to any species listed under either the State or Federal Endangered Species Acts (ESA) or protected under any other State or federal law as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from project implementation, authorization for such fill shall be secured from the Corps through the Section 404 permitting process and from the RWQCB as part of the Section 401 water quality certification process. ○ Consultation or incidental take permitting may be required under the ESA. The applicant shall obtain all legally-required permits from the USFWS for the “take” of protected species under the ESA. ○ Evidence that the applicant has secured any required authorization from these agencies shall be submitted to the City of Pacifica Planning Department prior to issuance of any grading or building permits for the project. 			
<p>Impact BIO-4: Movement of Species, Migratory Wildlife Corridors, or Native Wildlife Nursery Sites The project would alter existing habitat on approximately 1.23 acres of the 11.2-acre site,</p>	<p>BIO-3a: A qualified, California-registered landscape architect or restoration ecologist who specializes in native habitat restoration shall be retained by the applicant to incorporate the following provisions into the Landscape Plans for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prohibit the use of highly undesirable species in 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant/HOA</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>replacing portions of coastal scrub and ruderal habitat with residential development. However, these modifications are generally not expected to affect any native wildlife nursery areas, or substantially interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife, or obstruct migratory wildlife corridors. A substantial portion of the site would remain as undeveloped open space and would continue to be available for wildlife use and movement. Implementation of the proposed Natural Habitat Restoration program would improve the extent of natural habitat on the site, through the removal of invasive exotics and restoration of native cover along the former Fassler Avenue alignment.</p> <p>There is a possibility that proposed grading and the activities of future residents and visitors could further degrade the value of the</p>	<p>landscape improvements on the site which could spread into the adjacent open space areas. Unsuitable species include: acacia (<i>Acacia</i> spp.), giant reed (<i>Arundo donax</i>), iceplant (<i>Carpobrotus edulis</i>), pampas grass (<i>Cortaderia</i> spp.), cotoneaster (<i>Cotoneaster pannosus</i>), broom (<i>Cytisus</i> spp. and <i>Genista</i> spp.), Cape ivy, blue gum eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>), fennel, English ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>), bamboo (<i>Phyllostachys</i> spp.), Himalayan blackberry (<i>Rubus armeniacus</i>), gorse (<i>Ulex europaeus</i>), and periwinkle, among others identified in the Cal-IPC Inventory. This restriction on use of highly undesirable species in landscaping shall be included as a requirement in the CC&Rs for the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the <i>Natural Habitat Restoration Proposal</i>, including the eradication program to effectively eliminate highly aggressive non-native species such as French broom, Scotch broom, pampas grass, fennel, Fuller’s teasel, and poison hemlock from the site, and replace them with appropriate native shrub and groundcover species. • Define maintenance and monitoring provisions to ensure the successful establishment and long-term viability of native plantings and the control and eradication of highly aggressive non-native French broom, Scotch broom, pampas grass, Himalayan blackberry, periwinkle, and other noxious weeds from the 	<p>incorporated into Landscape Plan prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction, and after occupancy</p>		

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>remaining natural communities on the site for wildlife. Species such as French broom, Scotch broom (<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>), and pampas grass are currently not a severe problem on the site due in part to removal and control by the applicant. However, grading would create exposed slopes that provide preferred habitat for these species and development of the site could contribute to their spread if not carefully controlled. Dogs and cats owned by future residents of the project could harass or kill wildlife if not controlled, and night-time lighting could disrupt wildlife use of natural areas unless carefully designed. There is also a possibility that future residents could plant a number of highly invasive non-native plant species as landscaping. The California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) has identified certain plant species typically used in landscaping considered to be unsuitable</p>	<p>site. The maintenance and monitoring program shall be implemented during a minimum five year monitoring as part of <i>Natural Habitat Restoration Proposal</i>, and shall continue as part of long-term maintenance of open space areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for the immediate reseeding of all graded slopes not proposed for roadways, residences, and ornamental landscape plantings with a mix of native grasses and forbs appropriate for the site rather than a conventional seed mix typically used for erosion control purposes to replace and improve existing habitat values of grasslands disturbed on the site. • The revised landscape plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. <p>BIO-3b: The following additional provisions shall be implemented to further protect wildlife habitat resources, and shall be included in CC&Rs for the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibition on use of invasive plant species for landscaping. • Permanent fencing that obstructs wildlife movement shall be restricted to the vicinity of building envelopes, and shall not be allowed elsewhere on the site. Wildlife exclusionary fencing is designed to exclude wildlife and contains one or more of the following conditions: lowest horizontal is within 1.5 feet of ground, or 			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>due to their invasive character and tendency to out-compete native flora. Impacts are potentially significant on the wildlife habitat values of the site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-3a and BIO-3b would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>highest horizontal is over 6 feet, or top or bottom wire is barbed, or distance between top wires is less than 10 inches, or it combines with existing structures or fences, even on neighboring parcels, to create an obstacle to wildlife movement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting shall be carefully designed and controlled to prevent unnecessary illumination of natural habitat on the site. Lighting shall be restricted to the vicinity of building envelopes and the minimum level necessary to illuminate roadways and other outdoor areas. Lighting shall generally be kept low to the • Dogs and cats shall be confined to individual residences and the fenced portion of the building envelopes to minimize harassment and loss of wildlife, except dogs on leash and cats with bells on collars. • All garbage, recycling, and composting shall be kept in closed containers and latched or locked to prevent wildlife from using the waste as a food source. 			
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact CULT-1: Historical Resources The project site is currently vacant and does not contain resource of historical significance as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. However, impacts</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure MM-IV.C-1: Prior to excavation and construction of the proposed project, each individual worker of the prime contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall be informed on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying cultural resources or removing artifacts, human remains, bottles, paleontological resources, and other cultural materials from</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>on an unanticipated historic resource would result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 from the 2007 Fassler Avenue FEIR would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>the project site. A City-approved archaeologist shall inform these individuals of the following: the definition of a cultural resource, the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, how to locate and receive assistance from the City-approved archaeologist, and steps to be taken if cultural resources are encountered during project construction. A copy of the training materials and staff sign in sheets shall be provided to the City on request.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM-IV.C-2:</p> <p>A City-approved archaeological monitor shall be present to observe construction activities during any and all ground-disturbing activities that occur in association with the proposed project, including any utility and sewer hookups within the public streets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM-IV.C-3:</p> <p>In the event that an unanticipated cultural resource is exposed during project construction, work within 30 feet of the discovery shall stop until a City-approved archaeologist, meeting the standards of the Secretary of the Interior, can identify and evaluate the significance of the discovery and develop recommendations for treatment. Recommendations could include preparation of a Treatment Plan, which could require recordation, collection, and analysis of the discovery; preparation of a technical report, and curation of the collection and supporting documentation in an appropriate depository. However, as required by State law and in accordance with Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, if Native American</p>	<p>building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>		

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>remains are discovered at the project site during construction, work at the specific construction site at which the remains have been uncovered shall be suspended, and the appropriate City and County agencies immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.</p>			
<p>Impact CULT-2: Archaeological Resources There are no known archaeological resources on the project site and the site has been subject to previous grading related to quarrying. However, based on the topographic setting of the project site, there is a moderate possibility that unrecorded Native American cultural resources are present. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>				
<p>Impact CULT-3: Paleontological Resources Based on the geotechnical report prepared for the project site, there are no known paleontological resources or unique geological features on the project site. The 2007 Prospects Residential Project Final EIR determined that this is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Impact CULT-4: Human Remains Although it is believed that no human remains are known to have been found on the project site, it is possible that unknown resources could be encountered during project construction, particularly during ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>
GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
<p>Impact GEO-2: Landslides The Geotechnical Report did not identify evidence of slope failure or unstable slopes within the project site;</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1: A site-specific design level geotechnical evaluation shall be performed for the proposed project that shall include recommendations for seismic design, management of</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>however, landslides and debris flows are a recognized hazard in the Pacifica area, and the Geotechnical Report identified locations of previous landslide (debris flow) activity that extends downslope from the northern edge of the project site. These locations could be potential sources of future debris-flow activity below the upper edges of the northern side of the project site. If the grading and surface/subsurface drainage of project site is not appropriately designed and constructed, drainage from the project site could contribute to the saturation of soil in the nearby areas where local landslide scars were observed and potentially contribute to the triggering of new slope failures. Additionally, the heads of these landslide areas could eventually encroach upward, toward the outer edges of the proposed development on the project site, which could eventually</p>	<p>adverse soil conditions, grading, surface/subsurface drainage, and construction of structures (e.g., retaining walls). The design level geotechnical evaluation report shall be certified by a licensed professional geotechnical engineer (the Geotechnical Engineer of Record). All design measures, recommendations, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the design-level geotechnical evaluation shall be implemented as a condition of project approval. In addition, the design level geotechnical evaluation shall include a slope stability analysis to evaluate whether the proposed project could increase the instability of off-site landslides or be adversely affected by encroachment of off-site landslides onto the project site. The design level geotechnical evaluation shall also include a slope stability analysis for the proposed design of the fill slope on the north side of the project site which shall be updated if the design recommendations for this fill slope change from those presented in the Geotechnical Report Update. A third-party review of the slope stability analyses presented in the design level geotechnical evaluation shall be performed by a licensed professional Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist. Any remediation measures to address the potential impacts included in the design level geotechnical evaluation or third-party review of the design level geotechnical evaluation shall be implemented by the applicant. A copy of the draft design level geotechnical evaluation, third party review comments, and final design level geotechnical evaluation shall be provided to the City.</p> <p>The Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall perform oversight and inspection during construction activities to ensure that the</p>	<p>Implementation Frequency: The draft design level geotechnical evaluation, third party review comments, and final design level geotechnical evaluation must be provided to the City prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>		<p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>result in damage to proposed improvements on the project site. As discussed above, failure of the proposed fill slope along the north side of the project site could also occur if the fill slope is not appropriately designed and constructed. This is a potentially significant impact. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO1.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>design recommendations presented in the design level geotechnical evaluation report and third-party review are implemented. During grading and site preparation activities, the Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall regularly report to the City, providing written updates monthly, at minimum.</p>			
<p>Impact GEO-4: Unstable Soils The Geotechnical Report identified areas of fill presumably placed during former quarrying operations at the project site. The most obvious filled area is along the</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>outer margin of the bench (referred to also as the 'terrace') in the northwestern portion of the project site along the outside of the historic road. Other mounds of fill and woody debris are located on the 'terrace' and areas of deeper fill were encountered in the southern portion of the project site. The depth of fill materials varies across the project site. The presence of these fill materials could result in settlement/subsidence and lateral spreading or even landslides along the edges of the filled 'terrace' area if not properly managed or exacerbated by the project. This is a potentially significant impact which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 which requires preparation and implementation of a site-specific design level geotechnical evaluation report.</p>		<p>Implementation Frequency: The draft design level geotechnical evaluation, third party review comments, and final design level geotechnical evaluation must be provided to the City prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>		

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>				
<p>Impact GEO-5: The Geotechnical Report identified clayey fill materials with medium plasticity at the project site. These clayey soils may be expansive. The project does not include any improvements that would exacerbate any expansive soil hazards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would ensure impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: The draft design level geotechnical evaluation, third party review comments, and final design level geotechnical evaluation must be provided to the City prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>
NOISE				

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Impact NOISE-1: Exposure Persons to or Generate Noise Levels in Excess of Standards Construction noise impacts to off-site residential uses would be potentially significant given it may trigger the 80 dBA Leq eight-hour daytime threshold of significance. These impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-IV.G-2.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure MM-IV.G-2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays. No heavy construction equipment (e.g., trucks, pavers, concrete mixers, etc.) use shall be permitted on Weekends or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays. No construction activities shall be permitted on federal holidays as required by the City of Pacifica Municipal Code Section 8-1.06. • All construction equipment shall be equipped with improved noise muffling, and have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers, and engine isolators in good working condition. • Stationary construction equipment that generates noise levels in excess of 65 dBA Leq shall be located as far away from existing occupied buildings as possible. If required to minimize potential noise conflicts, the equipment shall be shielded from noise sensitive receptors by using temporary walls, sound curtains, or other similar devices. • All equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than five minutes. • An information sign shall be posted at the entrance to each construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive noise levels. The Applicant shall respond to all noise 	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans submitted to City prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	<p>complaints within 24 hours and shall provide the City with a written summary of the complaint and the response within 48 hours of the complaint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor shall minimize use of vehicle backup alarms. A common approach to minimizing the use of backup alarms is to design the construction site with a circular flow pattern that minimizes backing up of trucks and other heavy equipment. Another approach to reducing the intrusion of backup alarms is to require all equipment on the site to be equipped with ambient sensitive alarms. With this type of alarm, the alarm sound is automatically adjusted based on the ambient noise. • Construction worker’s radios shall be controlled so as to be inaudible beyond the limits of the project site boundaries. • Heavy equipment, such as paving and grading equipment, shall be stored on-site whenever possible to minimize the need for extra heavy truck trips on local streets. • Equipment used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered impact tools (e.g., jack hammers) wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically-powered tools. Where use of pneumatically-powered tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used. A muffler could lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dB(A). External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dB(A). Quieter 			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
	procedures shall be used (such as drilling rather than impact equipment) whenever feasible.			
<p>Impact NOISE-2 Substantial Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels</p> <p>The construction phase of the project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels by more than 5 dBA which is considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure MM-IV.G-2 would serve to reduce construction noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure MM-IV.G-2 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans submitted to City prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC				
<p>Impact TRAFFIC-3a: Sight Distance</p> <p>Intersection sight distance (ISD), also known as corner</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1a:</p> <p>The project shall provide adequate sight distance, as designated by the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, to/from</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>sight distance (CSD), is the sight distance required for the vehicle stopped on the minor roadway to see approaching vehicles on the major roadway and have time to make the decision to enter the intersection without interrupting flow.</p> <p>Based on field measurements, there is approximately 700 feet of sight distance from the proposed driveway looking to the west (downhill). Looking to the east from the driveway (uphill), with the fifteen-foot setback from the edge of the travel way, there is approximately only 60 feet of sight distance. The sight distance to the east is blocked by a tree and a hill. Drivers making a left or right turn out of the project driveway would have to pull out into the travel way in order to gain the necessary sight distance.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed re-striping allows for two 18-foot</p>	<p>westbound Fassler Avenue at the project driveway. This can be accomplished by removing the tree, cutting back a portion of the hill to the east of the project driveway, and re-striping Fassler Avenue to provide a shoulder. These sight distance measures shall be implemented prior to the initiation of any on-site construction activities so that adequate sight distance is provided for construction vehicles exiting the project site. The project shall also decrease the curb radii and/or include a standard driveway apron at the driveway to slow vehicles entering and exiting the project site. The grade of the sidewalk shall remain constant across the driveway.</p>	<p>Implementation Frequency: Design plans that include sight distance measures must be submitted to the City prior to issuance of grading/building permits and implemented during construction</p>		<p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>travel lanes and a 12-foot left-turn lane into the project. The re-striping could be done to provide a shoulder on the north side of Fassler Avenue, which would allow right turning vehicles exiting the project to pull out into the roadway without conflicting with eastbound downhill vehicles and gain adequate sight distance. Narrowing of the 18-foot travel lanes to 12 feet may also provide bicycles with a safer riding area along Fassler Avenue. For vehicles turning left to exit the project, removal of the tree and a portion of the hillside would be required to provide adequate sight distance.</p> <p>The proposed driveway appears to have larger-than-necessary curb radii given the low speed desired for vehicles entering and exiting the project. It is unclear from the site plan if the access point is provided via a standard driveway apron or an</p>				

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>intersection design with raised curbs. A standard driveway apron should be provided, as the apron design would create lower vehicle speeds entering and exiting the driveway and a more pleasant pedestrian experience by preserving the sidewalk grade across the driveway. Project access and circulation impacts are considered to be significant but can be reduced to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1a.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>				

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Impact TRAFFIC-3b: Ingress and Egress The proposed re-striping of Fassler Avenue would provide a 120-foot left-turn pocket in the eastbound (uphill) direction into the project site. As a result of this new twelve-foot lane, Fassler Avenue would have one eighteen-foot lane in each direction near the proposed driveway. These wide lanes would provide an area for bicyclists but could also encourage parking which could adversely affect access and circulation. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant but can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1b.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1b: Parking shall be prohibited along both sides of Fassler. Signage and red curb paint shall be used to prohibit parking in this area on both sides of the street. There is also a centerline stripe that is indicated to be white. Centerline striping shall be yellow throughout; the only white stripe shall be the stripe indicating the separation of the left-turn pocket from the eastbound travel lane. All improvements shall be consistent with the current edition of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and signed and striped consistent with the current edition of the California Manual of Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The restriping of Fassler Avenue shall be implemented prior to the initiation of any on-site construction activities.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Prior to on-site construction, during construction, and after occupancy</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>Impact TRAFFIC-5a: On-Site Pedestrian Access and Circulation</p> <p>While the project provides a pedestrian path connecting the area between Styles 4 and 5 to the open space to the west of the residential styles, the site plan does not call out a continuous proposed sidewalk on the main roadway within the project site. City of Pacifica Administrative Policy 74, Complete Streets Policy, would require the applicant to install complete street considerations in the design of the project. Municipal Code Section 10-1.905 (c) states that sidewalks may be omitted from subdivision plans if recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the Council. There appears to be five- to eight-foot spaces for pedestrians along the perimeter of the internal circulation roadway and five- to six-foot spaces along the roadway for the interior styles. This is considered a significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-2:</p> <p>The applicant shall revise the project plans to include a continuous sidewalk on the main roadway within the project site.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Updated project plans must be submitted to the City prior to issuance of grading/building permits and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
<p>impact but it can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level via implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-2</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Significant</p> <p>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</p>				
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact TRIBAL-1: California Register of Historic Resources of Local Register of Historic Resources</p> <p>No known tribal cultural resources have been identified or reported on the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 would reduce impacts to unknown cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources, to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 above.</p>	<p>Implementation Responsibility: Applicant</p> <p>Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction</p>	<p>Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica</p>	<p>Initials _____</p> <p>Date _____</p>

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
Potentially Significant Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant				
Impact TRIBAL-2: California Native American Tribe and Lead Agency In accordance with AB 52, Native American Tribes may request that Lead Agencies provide notification of projects. In the event that a Tribe has submitted a request for notification, the Lead Agency shall provide the Tribe with the opportunity to consult on projects early in the CEQA process. The City has not received requests for notification from any Tribes, so tribal consultation was not conducted. Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM-IV.C-1 through MM-IV.C-3 above.	Implementation Responsibility: Applicant Implementation Frequency: Measures must be included in building permit plans prior to issuance of grading/building permit and implemented during construction	Monitoring Responsibility: City of Pacifica	Initials _____ Date _____

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility & Timing	Monitoring Responsibility	Performance Objective
Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant				

This page was left intentionally blank